

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed July 12, 2004, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added or canceled so that claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 remain pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 were rejected as anticipated by Garg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,567,846, hereinafter Garg). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully reject the assertion made by the Official Action that Garg teaches a *display means for displaying the navigation image according to an instruction from said screen control means, wherein said screen control means transfers an instruction to said application control means using one of an event queue and a call function, said application control means transfers an instruction to said application means using one of an event queue and a call function, said application means transfers an instruction to said screen control means using an event queue, and said screen control means transfers an instruction to said display means using an event queue*. However, in order to expedite prosecution Applicants have amended the claims to clearly direct them to physical position navigation. Garg marginally relates to “navigation” of a user interface, such a browser (see Abstract). Though, Garg in no way relates to a physical position navigation device such as a device that displays a navigation image of a physical position of a user, as based on information from an external unit such as a global positioning system (see page 8, lines 7-15 of the patent application).

Garg fails to teach every limitation of both amended claims 1 and 4, the two pending independent claims. For example, Garg fails to teach an application control means for controlling an application means according to an internal state of a physical position navigation device. Garg makes no mention of physical position navigation. Moreover, conventionally, intimate knowledge of the physical position navigation device is needed in order to develop an application means that operate based on the internal state of a physical position navigation device. Furthermore, this device-dependency increases the amount of time needed to create a development environment for the hardware configuration of a physical position navigation device. In addition, it is difficult to debug the device-dependent applications, and therefore it is difficult to improve the efficiency of development of physical position navigation devices.

Neither Garg nor the conventional art teaches a physical position navigation device that includes an application control means to control applications based on the internal state of the physical navigation device, such that applications may be developed without understanding the operation of the physical position navigation device. This feature

In re Appln. of ARAKI et al.
Application No. 09/725,143

alleviates a problem endemic to physical position navigation devices, which typically provide no application program interfaces (APIs) for developing applications, and which may determine physical position based on different sets of information.

Accordingly, Garg fails to teach every limitation of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5. Thus, the rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Wesley Ferrebee, Reg. No. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 10/12/04
AWF/

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 7/29/03)